

REMARKS

Claims 1-4, 9-12 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Kuppermann or Miles in view of Feuerherm or Baba in view of Adachi. This rejection is traversed for the following reasons.

Claim 1 recites "a computerized device for post-processing said raw data readings by analyzing, filtering and quantifying said readings, said computerized device generating a quality number Q indicative of at least one of a number and intensity of streaks in said sample plastic parts." Although Applicants reserve the right to discuss applicability and combination of all the relied upon references, Applicants focus on the applicability of Adachi. Adachi was relied upon for teaching a simulating effect in molded plastic parts. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Adachi discloses simulating a resin flow through a mold but does not reference simulating a streaking effect in molded plastic parts. There is no reference to streaking in Adachi. Furthermore, none of the references teach or suggest "generating a quality number Q indicative of at least one of a number and intensity of streaks in said sample plastic parts." Thus, even if Kuppermann or Miles in view of Feuerherm or Baba in view of Adachi are combined, the invention of claim 1 does not result.

For the above reasons, claim 1 is patentable over Kuppermann or Miles in view of Feuerherm or Baba in view of Adachi. Claims 2-4 variously depend from claim 1 and are patentable over Kuppermann or Miles in view of Feuerherm or Baba in view of Adachi for at least the reasons advanced with respect to claim 1. Claims 9-12 include features similar to those in claim 1 and are patentable over Kuppermann or Miles in view of Feuerherm or Baba in view of Adachi for at least the reasons advanced with respect to claim 1.

Claims 5, 7, 13, 15, 19 and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Kuppermann or Miles in view of Feuerherm or Baba in view of Adachi and Smith. This rejection is traversed for the following reasons.

Smith teaches general digital signal processing techniques. There is no specific teaching of the steps recited in claims 5, 7, 13, 15, 19 and 22. A citation to general signal processing concepts is not sufficient to disclose steps recited in these claims, and the order of the processing steps. Thus, even if Smith is combined with Kuppermann or Miles in view of Feuerherm or Baba in view of Adachi the invention of claims 5, 7, 13, 15, 19 and 22 does not result.

Further, there is insufficient motivation to combine Smith with Kuppermann or Miles in view of Feuerherm or Baba in view of Adachi. The Examiner provides a general statement that "skilled artisan would have been aware of these techniques and, hence, would have been motivated to modify the previously disclosed teachings with the teachings of Smith in order to reduce development time and cost." This, motivation however only provides support for one of ordinary skill in the art applying digital signal processing techniques to Kuppermann or Miles in view of Feuerherm or Baba in view of Adachi. There is no motivation to derive the steps recited in these claims, and the order of the processing steps. Thus, there is insufficient motivation to modify the references to arrive at the claimed invention.

For the above reasons, claims 5, 7, 13, 15, 19 and 22 are patentable over Kuppermann or Miles in view of Feuerherm or Baba in view of Adachi and Smith.

In view of the foregoing remarks and amendments, Applicants submit that the above-identified application is now in condition for allowance. Early notification to this effect is respectfully requested.

If there are any charges with respect to this response or otherwise, please charge them to Deposit Account 06-1130.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

David A. Fox
Registration No. 38,807
Confirmation No. 8332
CANTOR COLBURN LLP
55 Griffin Road South
Bloomfield, CT 06002
Telephone (860) 286-2929
Facsimile (860) 286-0115
PTO Customer No. 23413

Date: April 22, 2004